

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slemmer (U.S. 6,240,533 B1), and further in view of Maufer et al. (U.S. 7,143,188 B2).

The Applicant previously argued in Amendment A that the rejection is improper because neither Slemmer nor Maufer, individually or in combination, disclose a single device that both bridges and routes incoming packets. The Examiner responded in the Final Office Action that this argument was not persuasive because “the features upon which applicant relies... are not recited in the rejected claim(s).”

Applicant respectfully disagrees that these features are not in the rejection claims. For example, referring to claim 1, the claim indicates a number of components that are contained in a firewall.

Nevertheless, for the sake of clarity and to speed prosecution, Applicant has amended the independent claims to make clear that the various components and/or steps operate on a single device. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 13 are in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 2-7, 10-12, and 14-22 are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the same reasons as those recited above for the independent claim, upon which they ultimately depend. These dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish these dependent claims from the cited references. For at least these reasons, claims 2-7, 10-12, and 14-22 are not anticipated or made obvious by the prior art outlined in the Office Action.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Marc S. Hanish/
Marc S. Hanish
Reg. No. 42,626

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
408-255-8001